

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ
رَبِّ زِدْنِي عِلْمًا

الرد على الملحدين

The Incoherence of the Atheists

المؤلف
عُثْمَانُ السَّيِّدُ

About Author

Anonymous, Make dua for me. For an original copy of the book, visit:

https://archive.org/details/@uthmanus_sayid

About Book

The primary goal of this book is to prove the existence of the Necessary Being (i.e., God) along with its respective Necessary Attributes (i.e., attributes required for its existence). It does not refute emotional arguments, as the existence of something does not depend on whether it satisfies one's emotions. For example, questions like "Why do people die if God exists?" are not addressed here. Answers to such questions depend on the specific beliefs of a religion. Therefore, they fall outside the scope of this book and are better suited to works focused on defending a particular faith. The general issue regarding emotional arguments is addressed in chapter "Emotional/Moral Rejections of Thiesm".

Sufficient for us is Allah

Version 0.1

Contact

UthmanAlSayid@Gmail.com

Contents

PART ONE: FOUNDATIONS OF RATIONAL THOUGHT... [Pg 4]

Introduction

Regarding Contradictions

Regarding Possibles, Impossibles, and Neccessaries

Regarding Cause and Effect

Regarding Infinite Regress

PART TWO: THE CASE FOR THE NECESSARY BEING... [Pg 10]

Introduction

The Emergent Aspect of all Things

The Necessary Being

The Necessary Being's Necessary Attributes

Disqualifying Other Religions

PART THREE: THE INCOHERENCE OF THE ATHEISTS... [Pg 24]

Introduction

The “SIX NUMBERS”

The Unreliability of Science

Misuse of the Statement, “Burden of Proof”

Atheism as a Reaction

Emotional/Moral Rejections of Theism

An Atheistic Society

PART FOUR: SUMMARY... [Pg 33]

Summary

PART ONE: FOUNDATIONS OF RATIONAL THOUGHT

Introduction

Before we prove the existence of the “Necessary Being” and its “Necessary Attributes”, we must first establish some basic principles. These ideas are like the foundation of a house. If the foundation is weak or broken, then anything built on top will collapse. In the same way, if we don’t have clear rules for thinking and reasoning, then any argument we make, even at the highest level of thinking, can be countered by nonsensical gibberish.

This part of the book is about building that strong foundation. We will go over the most important principles of clear thinking. These are not religious rules or personal opinions. They are basic truths that everyone, whether religious or not, needs to accept to think clearly and avoid contradiction.

First, we will talk about contradictions and why something cannot be true and false at the same time. Then we will explain the difference between possible, impossible, and necessary things, and why this matters. After that, we will look at the idea of cause and effect, how things come to be, and why they don’t just appear from nowhere. Finally, we will talk about infinite regress, explaining why regressing backwards forever without a starting point is of no sense.

Once we’ve covered these topics, we’ll be ready to begin our main goal: proving that a Necessary Being must exist, and that this Being has special attributes that nothing else in creation can have. But we must first clear the ground and lay the foundation. That is what Part One is for: constructing the foundations of rational thought.

Allah’s Help is Upon the Believers

Regarding Contradictions

Let it be known that a contradiction cannot exist in real life. For if it were possible for a contradiction to exist, then nothing could be claimed, known, or exist. Truth would become meaningless. In a reality where contradictions could exist, it would be impossible for one to say whether or not contradictions can exist. This is because it would become possible in the same reality to say contradictions cannot exist, because contradictions do exist.

Take the simple example of a lightbulb. The lightbulb is either on or off. If one were to say that this lightbulb is on but at the same time off, one would never know the condition or state of the lightbulb. The question of whether or not the lightbulb is on or off would become meaningless because we would never be able to know its state. The light bulb could be on when it is off and vice versa. In a nutshell, the states of things could not be known had contradictions existed.

Furthermore, the one who believes contradictions can exist would never be able to propagate their own beliefs to another person. This is because they could not know if they even believe in whatever they believe. Everything one says or believes in would become meaningless, as the state of what one says would not come under the umbrella of being true or false due to the existence of contradictions. Things would become true and false at the same time.

Everything would become equivalent to gibberish. As for the one who asks if a square circle can exist, it is to be said to them, a square has four sides, and a circle has zero sides. For a shape to have both of them at the same time would be impossible. The shape would either have four sides, disqualifying it from being a circle, or it would have zero sides, disqualifying it from being a square. The one who utters the words, square-circle, has uttered a word with no meaning or identity. One has therefore uttered something equivalent to “Bla Bla Bla”, which also has no meaning or identity. One has uttered gibberish.

As for the definition of what a contradiction is, Aristotle’s definition suffices. “It will not be possible for the same thing to be and not to be.”

Sufficient for Us is Allah

Regarding Possibles, Impossibles, and Neccessaries

Know that the existence of an extramental object is either possible, impossible, or necessary. An extramental object refers to a thing that exists outside of one's mind. For example, a pencil, a tree, a car, or a house.

As for objects whose existence is deemed possible, they do not exist by default. They must be brought into reality by what is known as a causer. We will discuss cause and effect in the next part. We know that possible things do not exist by default but rather require a causer. If they did exist by default, we would witness many interesting things. For example, it is very possible for there to be a million dollars in a poormans wallet, yet it remains nearly empty. This example shows that possible things do not exist on their own; many things have a possible existence, yet they do not actually exist.

It might be said that this only proves that some possible things cannot exist by default, not all. However, proving that even some possible things do not exist by default is enough to show that possible things, in general, do not possess the inherent nature of existing without a cause. If possible things did have such a nature, they would not be considered possibles, but rather necessities.

As for an object whose existence is deemed impossible, it cannot ever exist. For example, as mentioned earlier, a square circle. If it were possible for impossible things to exist, then they would no longer be classified as impossible, but rather as possible.

As for objects whose existence is deemed necessary, they cannot cease to exist. For example, one's parents. Had one's parents not come into existence, one would not exist. Therefore, in relation to one's own existence, one's parents' existence is necessary.

This topic may seem simple at first glance, but it is essential to lay down even the most basic principles with clarity. These principles serve as firm reference points for the mind, especially in moments of confusion or doubt. Without such foundations, one cannot proceed with a deeper inquiry into the main purpose of the book.

And Guidance is From Allah

Regarding Cause and Effect

Know that every possible thing has a causer. A causer is what brings a thing into existence. Impossible things do not have causers, as they are non-existent to begin with. Necessary things do not have causers, as their existence is not dependent on anything else; they must exist necessarily by their very nature.

As for the one who may say that in the previous topic it was stated that one's parents are necessary, yet their existence clearly has a causer, one must note that the necessity of one's parents' existence is relational—it is necessary in relation to the child, not in and of itself. The example of parents was used to illustrate relational necessity, not absolute necessity.

This relational example was chosen because, from the atheist's perspective, there are no things in reality that exist necessarily in and of themselves. We could have used the existence of God as an example, since it is the only actual case of true necessary existence. However, an atheist would not accept this as a valid example, which is why a more neutral, relational example was given instead.

One might attest saying that, why cannot it be that a caused thing causes itself? It is to be said to them that the caused thing would have to exist in the first place along with the required power to be able to cause itself into existence. How could nothing do anything?

And Allah Knows Best

Regarding Infinite Regress

Know that a regress continuing infinitely would never allow the present to occur. Take the well-known example of the sniper. The sniper requires permission from his superior before assassinating his target. That superior, in turn, needs permission from his own superior to give the sniper permission. And that superior needs permission from his superior, and so on, ad infinitum. Will the sniper ever assassinate his target? No, he will not. The action will never be carried out because the chain of permissions has no beginning, and therefore no point at which permission is actually granted.

As for the one who objects to this example by claiming that an infinite regress into the past is possible—meaning that something can exist now while its causes stretch endlessly backward into the past—this claim is futile. Such a person should be asked: What comes first—the past, the present, or the future? Of course, it goes in that order. So, how can one say that an infinite regress into the past is possible, when all those past events would have to occur for the present to exist?

Furthermore, what is the reasoning of someone who claims that backward regress is possible after accepting that every caused thing must have a causer? Do they not realize that all parts of the regress being caused, would each require a causer? If they understand this, then they should also understand that any regress occurring in the present would require all preceding regresses to have occurred first. But if those preceding causes are infinite in number, they would never actually be completed. Therefore, the present causes could never occur.

In conclusion, an infinite regress of causes is not logically possible because it would prevent the present from ever coming into being. This is because all past causes would need to occur first for the present to occur, and that would never happen if the past were truly infinite.

Only is Allah the First and the Last

PART TWO: THE CASE FOR THE NECESSARY BEING

Introduction

Now that we have covered some of the fundamental principles of rational thought, we can begin proving the existence of the Necessary Being using logic and some basic science. In the next part, we will establish the emergent aspect of all things in our universe. This means that the existence of everything around us falls under the category of possibles, not necessities. And as we have discussed in “Regarding Possibles, Impossibles, and Necessaries”, a thing whose existence is possible requires a causer.

We will prove that the things around us are emergent in three different ways. This is done so that if one method does not convince the reader, the others might. Once this is established, we will move on to discuss the Necessary Being. As for what we mean by the Necessary Being, it is that being or thing whose existence is required in order for the existence of anything else to be. In other words, without the Necessary Being, nothing whose existence is possible would ever come into existence.

Thereafter, we will move on to the Necessary Attributes that must belong to the Necessary Being. These will also be proven using logic alone. These attributes include being one, independent, eternal, everlasting, and completely unlike anything in creation.

And finally, we will end off with a brief ruling on which religions automatically become disqualified from being considered true religions. This is because their claimed Necessary Being does not match what sound logic and reason prove to be the true Necessary Being, also known as God.

All Praise Belongs to Allah

The Emergent Aspect of all Things

All things in our observable universe that exist outside of the mind, meaning their existence is extramental, are known to have a beginning—just as each person has a beginning from their parents. This is not something disputed by modern science; however, we will still prove it using three proofs of our own.

First Proof: All Physical Bodies Undergo Stillness and Motion

All physical things in our reality are either in a state of stillness or in motion. A pencil, for example, is either lying still on a desk or being moved by someone's hand. These two states—stillness and motion—cannot exist in the object at the same time, and yet the object transitions between them. This means the object's condition is not fixed or necessary in itself.

What this reveals is that the object does not have absolute independence in its existence. If something truly existed necessarily, its state would be unchanging and self-sufficient. A necessary being cannot be one way at one time and another way at another, because it would then depend on external factors to determine its state. The fact that physical things alternate between conditions like stillness and motion is evidence that they are not necessary beings but are instead contingent and emergent.

In short, anything that shifts between contrary states is not necessary in its existence. Since all physical objects undergo such shifts, all physical objects are emergent and dependent on causes outside themselves. They do not exist by the necessity of their own nature, but through something else.

To put it simply, anything that relies on being in a state of stillness or motion cannot have necessary existence, since it depends on those emergent qualities to exist. If its existence were truly necessary, it would not depend on any emergent condition but would exist by its nature.

Second Proof: Matter Can Transform into Energy

All physical objects are made of matter, and it is a confirmed scientific fact that matter can be converted into energy, as expressed in Einstein's famous equation: $E = mc^2$. This conversion is not theoretical; it is observed in real-world processes such as nuclear reactions. The very fact that matter can cease to be matter and instead become energy proves that its form is not essential to its existence.

A thing that is truly necessary must exist as it is and cannot be otherwise. It cannot shift forms or lose its defining nature. But matter clearly does not meet this standard. It can be broken down, rearranged, and transformed into something fundamentally different. This shows that matter does not have the kind of self-contained, absolute existence that a necessary being would have.

Therefore, matter is not necessary. It is a temporary form, dependent on external laws and conditions. Since everything in our universe is made of matter, everything shares this emergent and contingent nature.

Simply put, anything whose identity can change or be transformed cannot exist necessarily. If it did exist necessarily, it would be immutable, since change entails a shift in identity. And a shift in identity shows that neither the original nor the altered identity is necessary; otherwise, that identity would always exist. Matter's identity changes into energy via $E = mc^2$ and vice versa.

Third Proof: An Infinite Chain of Past Material States Is Impossible

The final proof presented that matter is emergent lies in the impossibility of an infinite past. Everything made of matter undergoes change and exists in a state that depends on previous states. The current form of the universe, including every physical object, depends on a chain of prior states that led to this moment.

Now, if these past states of matter stretch back infinitely with no beginning, then the present moment could never be reached. To arrive at the present, the infinite past would have to be crossed—step by step, cause by cause. But an actual infinite

cannot be traversed. If the past had no beginning, it would be like trying to climb to the top of a staircase with no bottom step. One would never begin the climb, and therefore never reach the top.

But the present clearly exists. We are here. That means the chain of material states leading up to now must have had a starting point. In other words, matter must have come into being. It cannot have existed forever without origin, and anything that comes into being is by definition emergent, not necessary.

Simply put, every past state of matter must occur before its present state can exist. If matter had existed eternally without a beginning, it would never reach a present state because its past events would stretch on infinitely, never completing. For clarity, refer back to the section “Regarding Infinite Regress.”

One should not be confused if we are in the past, present, or future. The past consists of events that have already occurred, the present is what is happening now, and the future comprises events yet to come.

Concluding

These three proofs together show that matter in our universe is not necessary in itself but is emergent and contingent. First, every physical object alternates between stillness and motion, which reveals its dependence on external causes. Second, matter’s ability to transform into energy demonstrates that its form is not essential or unchanging. Third, the impossibility of traversing an infinite chain of past material states requires that matter had a beginning rather than existing eternally.

Modern science itself confirms this emergent nature of matter. Observations of the expanding universe tell us that space and the matter within it began in a hot, dense state and have since evolved and spread out over time. The fact that matter was once compressed into a singular origin and later emerged as the galaxies, stars, planets, and particles we see today underscores that matter did not exist by necessity but came into being through processes that science continues to explore.

Sufficient is Allah Alone

The Necessary Being

The following text is paraphrased and rewritten from the great book Al-Kharīda al-Bahīya, written by the profound Islamic scholar Ahmad al-Dardīr, may Allah be pleased with him. Ameen.

Given the emergence of all matter, there must exist some causer who brought the world into existence. Clearly, every effect points to the existence of an effector. Refer to the section “Regarding Cause and Effect” for more on causality.

This creator of the world either exists necessarily or exists contingently. If the creator exists necessarily, then the existence of God is established, since a necessary causer is precisely what we mean by “God.”

If the creator exists contingently, then its existence would depend on yet another creator to bring it into being. If that second creator were contingent, it would require a third, and so on without end. Such an endless chain of creators would entail an infinite regress, which is impossible (see “Regarding Infinite Regress” for more on this). Therefore, any series of contingent creators must ultimately rest on a necessary being to initiate the sequence. A necessary being is exactly what we mean by “God.”

Either way, God’s existence is entailed. Even if one wishes to appeal to the Big Bang or other cosmological events, those too would require a causer, and the same reasoning applies without end.

Allah is The Greatest

The Necessary Being's Necessary Attributes

Now that we have established the existence of a Necessary Being—whether the first extramental existence began by it at the Big Bang or before it—we will now examine the attributes that this Necessary Being must possess. By “attribute,” we mean a quality that subsists within the very essence of its possessor. We will focus on six primary attributes, divided into two categories: the first category contains one attribute, and the second contains five. Each of these six attributes will be deduced through logical reasoning. Finally, we will use this sound logic to identify which religions are incompatible with the true Necessary Being.

The first category is called Self Attributes. It consists of one attribute: existence. Existence is self-evident; there is no proper definition for it. Since we have established the Necessary Being, it must exist; therefore, it possesses the attribute of existence, which we may also describe as life.

The second category is referred to as Privative Attributes. It consists of five: Beginninglessness, Everlastingness, Independence, Uniqueness, and Oneness.

There is also a third category called the Attributes of Meaning, but it lies beyond the scope of this book and falls under independence, so it will not be addressed here. Interested readers may refer to *Al-Kharīda al-Bahīya* for further study on it.

Below are the logical proofs for each of the Privative Attributes, presented in the order given above:

Beginninglessness:

Know that the Necessary Being is characterized by beginninglessness. Emergent things require a cause, but the Necessary Being has no cause. If it had a beginning, that beginning would itself demand a cause—either a contingent cause (resulting in an infinite regress) or another necessary cause (which would merely shift the problem back). Moreover, if it had a beginning, its existence would be possible rather than necessary. To avoid both infinite regress and circularity, the Necessary Being must be truly without beginning.

Everlastingness:

Know that the Necessary Being is characterized by everlastingness. Everlastingness follows from beginninglessness and existence. A being that has neither a beginning nor an end must exist at every point in time. If there were ever a point at which it did not exist, it could not exist now, for it would require a cause to restore it. Such dependence would make its existence possible rather than necessary.

Therefore, it exists through all time past, present, and future without interruption. The terms past, present, and future do not apply to the Necessary Being. Time measures change or events, and the Necessary Being's identity does not change, since it is independent and without beginning. There is nothing in it to measure, and so time cannot be attributed to it.

Time can also serve to distinguish emergent things. If something can be measured by time, it must have a starting point. Without a starting point nothing can reach the present, since an infinite amount of past time would have to pass on it to for it arrive at now.

Independence:

Know that the Necessary Being is characterized by Independence. Independence means the Necessary Being's existence and attributes do not rely on anything else. Because it is self-existent (having no cause) and unchanging, it cannot depend on external conditions, materials, or agents. If it did, those conditions would limit or alter it, contradicting its necessary, self-sufficient nature. We have already discussed contradictions in previous chapters. Moreover, it could then be said that the thing it depends on is truly necessary, and not it.

Uniqueness:

Uniqueness means that the Necessary Being cannot share any attributes with emergent things. This is because all attributes of emergent things are subject to contingency as their identities are not necessary but rather possible. So if the Necessary Being shared any attributes with any emergent thing, it would be part emergent or part possible. And that is impossible for the independent and eternal Necessary Being.

When the Necessary Being and created objects are both described as having attributes such as existence, will, power, or love, this is a similarity of terminology only. We call created things existent and we call the Necessary Being existent, but their modes of existence are entirely different. The created thing's existence is possible, while the Necessary Being's existence is necessary. The same applies to will, power, or love. They share a name, not a mode of reality. Therefore, there is no similarity implied in saying the Necessary Being loves, and we love.

Oneness:

Know that there can only be one Necessary Being. Credit is due to the Holy Quran for its powerful argument against polytheism. As stated in Surah Al-Anbya (22): "Had there been gods beside Allah, in the heavens and the earth, both of them would have fallen in disorder. So pure is Allah, the Lord of the Throne, from what they describe." This verse indicates that if there were more than one Necessary Being, they would act independently, leading to cosmic chaos and disorder.

Regarding the will of the Necessary Being, one might object that we have not established the Necessary Being possessing a will, and thus cannot claim multiple Necessary Beings would act independently. Therefore, we establish here that the Necessary Being must possess will. By "will," we mean the Necessary Being's option to create something or leave it non-existent.

We know the Necessary Being must have this option. If it functioned automatically, like fire burning cotton upon contact without choice, then the universe would be eternal. Since the Necessary Being exists eternally, an automatic cause-and-effect relationship would mean the effect (the universe) also exists

eternally. However, we have already established that the universe is not eternal, a position even scientists do not hold.

Continuing, one might argue that if two or more Necessary Beings existed, their wills would necessarily be identical, as they all possess the same perfect, independent qualities. However, this is a significant confusion. Such identity of will would only be required if the Necessary Beings were obligated to always do what is objectively best for creation. Only then could we assert their wills must align. But this is demonstrably false. The Necessary Being clearly does not do everything that might seem "best" for us in a worldly sense (otherwise, we would all possess immense wealth or have every desire fulfilled).

It is entirely possible for one perfect Necessary Being to will one thing and another perfect Necessary Being to will something different. This divergence would not compromise their essential attributes, for part of being independent is the freedom to will whatever they choose whenever they choose.

Now, let us focus on the inherent contradiction in multiple Necessary Beings. Suppose two such beings exist: one wills the world to be created, and the other wills it to be destroyed. Whose will prevails?

If one will overpowers the other and takes effect, the overpowered being is shown to be dependent, contradicting its status as Necessary.

If both wills take effect simultaneously, this results in the logical contradiction of the world both existing and not existing – an impossibility.

One might counter by proposing two Necessary Beings with identical wills, hoping to avoid contradiction. However, the same fundamental problem arises. Suppose both Beings will the world into existence. The critical question remains: which one actually creates it? Both cannot be the sole creator of the same act of creation; creation is not a shared task like lifting a physical object. Even with identical wills, only one will can ultimately be efficacious for a specific creative act. For example, if two people will to turn on the same light switch, only one can physically perform the act. The efficacy of one will in creation would render the other being's will ineffective in that instance, implying dependence and undermining its status as a truly independent Necessary Being.

One might object again by proposing two Necessary Beings with different wills that do not conflict. For example, one Necessary Being creates the earth and the second creates the moon. We would reply that the mere possibility of a contradiction is enough to rule out that scenario.

For instance, could the first Necessary Being instead choose to create the moon? If one says no, they must explain why not without implying that the first depends on the second. If one says yes, then we must ask whose will would prevail: the will of the first Necessary Being, originally assigned to create the earth but now deciding to create the moon, or the will of the second Necessary Being, which was to create the moon all along? Both cannot create the same object, as we have already shown in our discussion of identical wills.

We noted earlier that the Necessary Being does not always do what seems best for us. Someone might ask how we know this. Each person can judge for themselves by considering what would truly improve human health, social conditions, or global affairs. It is clear that the world does not reflect the best possible state. If a reader still rejects this point, they may skip ahead to the discussion showing how even identical wills would lead to contradiction.

Concluding Statement:

Therefore, based on the Quranic argument against cosmic disorder and the logical impossibility of reconciling independent wills—whether the wills are conflicting or identical—without creating dependency or contradiction, it is rationally necessary to conclude that there can be only one absolutely independent, Necessary Being.

Who can be helped except Allah wills it?

Disqualifying Other Religions

Having established through sound logic the essential attributes of the Necessary Being—Existence, Beginninglessness, Everlastingness, Independence, Uniqueness, and Oneness—we now possess an objective criterion by which to evaluate truth claims from religions. These attributes are necessary conclusions derived from the very nature of reality, causality, and contingency. Any conception of the Divine that contradicts these rationally inescapable attributes must, by definition, be false.

This is not a matter of cultural preference or scriptural interpretation alone. It is a test of metaphysical coherence:

- If a "god" is said to have a beginning, it cannot be the Necessary Being.
- If a "god" depends on another for existence or power, it violates Independence.
- If a "god" shares its essential attributes with creation in the same mode, it negates Uniqueness.
- If multiple "gods" are proposed, they collapse into logical absurdity, as demonstrated by Oneness.

In this section, we can apply this universal standard to major religious traditions. We can examine whether their core doctrines:

- Affirm a Being whose existence is truly necessary (not contingent),
- Align with the six attributes derived from pure reason,
- Avoid contradictions that would reduce the Divine to the level of the possible or emergent.

Any religion failing this test—whether by denying the Necessary Being's singularity, subjecting it to time, attributing dependence to it, or conflating its attributes with creation's—disqualifies itself as a bearer of ultimate truth. The path of reason, now fixed upon these unshakeable pillars, leaves no room for compromise, and from it we shall know which religion can be true.

Exalted is Allah from what they ascribe to Him

Test:

We will examine six major religions. One can apply the blueprint above to any other faith. The religions we will consider in order are Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Sikhism, Buddhism, and Islam.

Christianity:

The trinity refutes Christianity off the bat. The Christians will argue that God is complex, and we agree. However, he is not impossible.

Judaism:

Jews are notorious for being able to deceive God. What type of God is this?

Furthermore, verses that insight the existence of other Gods: Exodus 15:11, Psalm 82:1, Psalm 86:8, Psalm 45

Hinduism:

Undisclosed polytheism and paganism.

Sikhism:

Similar to Hinduism, but not entirely the same, Sikhism too describes God as Nirgun and Sargun, where the suffix 'gun' etymologically means 'attributes', while sar means 'with (all)' and 'nir' means 'none'. In summary, contradictory God or polytheistic.

Buddhism:

Not a religion centered around God.

Islam:

Islam passes the logical test, as it declares everything in Surah Al-Ikhlās:

1. Say (O Muhammad (ﷺ)): "He is Allah, (the) One. 2. "Allah-us-Samad (The Self-Sufficient Master, Whom all creatures need, He neither eats nor drinks). 3. "He begets not, nor was He begotten; 4. "And there is none co-equal or comparable unto Him."

PART THREE: THE INCOHERENCE OF THE ATHIESTS

Introduction

Now that we have established a foundation for rational thought and have proved the existence of the Necessary Being (that is, God), along with its Necessary Attributes (the attributes required for its identity to be coherent with logic), and have formed a test for disqualifying false religions, we will now discuss the incoherence found in atheism.

Among atheists, many are observed criticizing religion as a whole, despite their understanding of it being limited to what they have personally apostatized from. Some say, “We do not believe God is a flying man in the sky,” though most religions do not claim such a thing, except for Christianity. Others say, “We dislike believing in silly fairy tales,” yet the most absurd and contradictory claims are often found in their own explanations for the origin of matter.

Some ask, “There are many religions, which one should we follow?” as if most religions have not already collapsed under the weight of their own falsity, false prophecies, and unpreserved traditions—leaving only a few that remain coherent and historically verifiable. Such a question also becomes invalid once one has been provided with a logical test to falsify religions, a test which has already been laid out in this book. Which ultimately disqualifies every religion except Islam.

This method of falsifying religions was not invented by the author. It has existed in the Islamic philosophical tradition for nearly a thousand years. One can refer to scholars such as Imam al-Taftazani, may Allah have mercy on him. Yet the atheist rarely looks beyond his immediate environment, his own limited worldview. This willful arrogance is what keeps them blind to these realities. May they be damned with their arrogance.

We will then begin the third part of this book by discussing six numbers. As Martin Rees wrote in *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces that Shape the Universe*:

“A few basic physical laws set the rules; our emergence from a simple Big Bang was sensitive to six cosmic numbers. Had these numbers not been well tuned, the gradual unfolding of layer upon layer of complexity would have been quenched.” (Basic Books, 2000, p.161)

These numbers are so finely tuned that denying the existence of a creator is far more fictional than believing in one.

Following that, we will examine the unreliability of science, however, not to reject science for Islam encourages critical thinking, observation, and research. The Islamic Golden Age is evidence of this. The Holy Quran states:

“In the creation of the heavens and the earth; in the alternation of night and day; in the ships that sail the seas with goods for people; in the water which God sends down from the sky to give life to the earth when it has been barren, scattering all kinds of creatures over it; in the changing of the winds and clouds that run their appointed courses between the sky and the earth: there are signs in all these for those who use their minds.” (Quran 2:164)

Indeed, for those who contemplate the natural world, they will get to know numerous things from it. The unreliability of science appears when it attempts to overstep its limits and present itself as the ultimate authority, as though it had never claimed the Earth was flat, or that the universe was static. Clearly, science cannot serve as an absolute standard, as it is always subject to correction and human error.

Moving forward, we will address the misuse of phrases such as “burden of proof,” explain how atheism is often a reaction rather than a position, and examine how atheism functions as a coping mechanism for many. We will conclude this third section with a discussion on emotional rejections of theism, and end with a powerful prediction for an atheistic society from Daniel Haqiqatjou, a great thorn in the minds of the reformists and disbelievers.

And He (Allah) created all things.

The “SIX NUMBERS”

Atheists often dismiss faith as "fairy tales" or "flying men in the sky," yet their own materialist explanations for existence rely on absurdities far exceeding religious claims. Their dismissal of divine purpose ignores overwhelming evidence of cosmic fine-tuning, revealing not ignorance but willful arrogance. As Martin Rees demonstrates, the universe's very structure hinges on six exquisitely balanced numbers—a precision demanding intelligent design (Rees 161).

These numbers operate with lethal sensitivity. The first, N (10^{36}), governs gravity's weakness relative to atomic forces. Were it slightly smaller, stars would be miniature furnaces, burning out in millennia, crushing any potential life. The second, ϵ (0.007), controls nuclear binding. A shift to 0.006 prevents star-forming elements; a shift to 0.008 erases hydrogen, leaving no water or chemistry. Life is impossible outside this razor-thin margin (Rees 30–31, 49–51). Such parameters are not arbitrary; they are non-negotiable conditions for a habitable cosmos.

The universe's expansion and structure further testify to divine curation. Ω (omega), the density of cosmic matter, required initial tuning to unity within one part in a quadrillion (10^{15})—any deviation would cause premature collapse or runaway dispersion, preventing galaxy formation. λ (lambda), a repulsive "antigravity," was discovered to be small yet non-zero. Had it been larger, it would have shredded embryonic galaxies. Q ($\sim 10^{-5}$), the amplitude of primordial ripples, dictates cosmic texture: smaller values yield dark, inert voids; larger values spawn only monstrous black holes (Rees 73–74, 88–89, 99, 114–116). Only our precise values permit stable stars and planets.

The final number, \square (three spatial dimensions), is equally critical. Two dimensions forbid complex, interconnected life (like digestive tracts); four dimensions destabilize orbits essential for planetary systems. This dimensional constraint, coupled with the others, forms an irreducible matrix for complexity (Rees 136). Denying a Creator amidst such precision is not rational skepticism—it is a delusion far more fantastical than the "fairy tales" atheists mock. As the Quran declares: "Indeed, in the creation of the heavens and the earth... are signs for those who use their intellect" (2:164).

“All of this is a mere coincidence; it all popped into existence with a bang, and there is no designer”. This is the fairy tale of the atheist in a nutshell.

Then will you not reason?

The Unreliability of Science

It should be known that the reliability of science cannot be affirmed as absolute. Atheists often claim that through science, they know everything truthfully, but this is far from reality. If an atheist believes something today, they may change their belief tomorrow based on a new discovery. For example, an atheist might accept the Big Bang theory today but reject it tomorrow if new evidence arises. This is the nature of science, which is mostly upheld by the method of induction. Nothing can ever be known with complete certainty by scientists because a future discovery might overturn current knowledge.

Consider the famous problem of induction: a person observes geese every day and notices they are all white. After many observations, he becomes confident that all geese must be white. However, one day he encounters a black goose, which completely disproves his assumption.

To give two real examples, an article from the University of Wisconsin states, “Until the 1920s, cosmology was still dominated by the theory of a Steady State Universe, or the idea that the universe was homogeneous (having the same general make-up throughout), infinite (that the universe extends forever), and static (the universe is not expanding, it just is).” So if a religious text had opposed this scientific view before the 1920s, would it have been ridiculed for contradicting science, or would atheists have been humble enough to admit that science might be wrong? Of course, it would have been the former!

Another example is the belief that stress, spicy food, and lifestyle cause stomach ulcers. This was debunked by Barry J. Marshall and J. Robin Warren for their discovery of the bacterium *Helicobacter pylori* and its role in gastritis and peptic ulcer disease. If a religious text had opposed the false scientific claim at that time,

would religion have been mocked, or would atheists humbly accept that science could be mistaken? Again, it would have been the former.

The examples given above are not the only existing examples; one can take a quick Google search, or realize by themselves the flaw of the scientific method. And how we can never know anything in science for certain, as new evidence may arise.

Atheists have wrongly accepted science as an objective source of knowledge when it is not. Rather, it is subjective in every manner. Damned be the arrogants.

Allah knows what they know not

Misuse of the Statement, “Burden of Proof”

The atheists say that there is no proof for religion, and that religion carries the burden of proof. But what religion are they referring to? A random satanic cult in some part of Germany? If so, then we agree there is no proof for such a belief system. But what about a pure monotheistic religion that teaches there is no god but one, that nothing is equal to Him, and that He is independent and eternal? Do they also claim that there is no logical, historical, or scientific evidence for this? Do they still insist that the burden of proof applies here as well? If so, then we strongly disagree. The proofs for a monotheistic religion that does not violate the principles of logic certainly exist. We have already presented these proofs in the previous two chapters. And when these proofs are applied, they point clearly and consistently to only one religion, and that religion is Islam.

As for the other religions claiming to be monotheistic, we have already passed said discussion.

Atheism as a Reaction

Due to their negligence and inability to correctly evaluate the existence of religion, many atheists use this flaw as a justification to become atheists, claiming that science is the true source of logic and verifiable knowledge. However, the issue with this stance is that they themselves are incapable of providing a coherent solution to how the universe came into existence without an eternal creator. This inability to answer a question that religion addresses with clarity, after having rejected religion for emotional or misrepresented reasons, is what makes atheism more of a reaction to false belief systems rather than an actual position grounded in truth. As for science, which atheists often claim as their source of knowledge, we have already addressed its limitations earlier in this discussion.

but they deceive not except themselves and they do not perceive

Emotional/Moral Rejections of Theism

As for emotional arguments against religion, these arguments do not disprove religion. If God exists, and He is truly the creator of everything, and truly the sustainer of everything, then who has the right to object when He chooses to destroy what He was sustaining in the first place? For example, if an entire city is destroyed by an earthquake, how can this action be considered unjust when He has full control and ownership over everything from the beginning? Even if someone cries out and argues that God is unjust, how does this prove that He does not exist? Clearly, emotional arguments do not stand as valid tests for whether a religion is true or false.

He (God) is not questioned about what He does, but they (mankind) will be questioned

An Atheistic Society

Daniel Haqiqatjou, a popular defender of Islam and a critic of the reformists, the liberals, the Hindus, the Jews, the atheists, and all that is between them, gives a realistic depiction of an atheistic society—one that is driven solely by the pursuit of pleasure and technological advancement, until it reaches a point of complete ruin.

The Debate of Daniel and a renowned atheist:

<https://muslimskeptic.com/2022/11/21/which-is-better-for-society/>

PART FOUR: SUMMARY

Summary

This work systematically lays down a foundation for thought that is used to deduce the existence of God. It then disqualifies five major religions, except for the one true monotheistic religion, Islam. It concludes by addressing several logical incoherences in atheism and referencing Daniel Haqiqatjou's debate with a renowned atheist. That debate showcases the future trajectory of an atheist society and highlights further issues with atheism that are not covered in this book.

We pray for God's forgiveness

May Allah allow this work to be used for His sake, Ameen.

All praise is due to Allah for allowing the completion of this work on:

Dhul al-Hijjah 29, 1446 AH

June 25, 2025 C.E